

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 9 is amended. No new matter is added.

Claim 9 is amended for clarity.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 2, item 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Purnaveja (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,241) in view of Sani (NPL-Java Applets #4, April 1998, pgs. 1-6). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Purnaveja, in view of Sani, fails to render claims 1-21 obvious.

First, in addition to the deficiency acknowledged in the Office Action, Purnaveja is further deficient. Specifically, Purnaveja fails to disclose or suggest synchronizing the delayed image output information for the markup document with applet output information for the applet linked to the markup document, as defined in claim 1.

Also, Purnaveja fails to disclose or suggest that image output information of the markup document and applet output information of the applet are synchronized to be displayed simultaneously, as defined in claim 9.

Also, Purnaveja fails to disclose or suggest the presentation engine that synchronizes and outputs the delayed image output information of the markup document and the applet output to the display device for simultaneous display, as defined in claim 15.

Also, Purnaveja fails to disclose or suggest a programmed computer processor to control synchronous output of the markup document image including the linked applet image to the display device, according to display control information included in the markup document image and/or in the linked applet image, as defined in claim 19.

That is, instead of synchronizing a markup document and an applet, Purnaveja discloses synchronizing video/audio frames with annotations, where annotations are displayable events such as HTML pages with Java applets to be displayed in one or more event windows (see, for example, col. 9, lines 47-56, col. 2, lines 45-48, and Abstract at lines 10-12 of Purnaveja). Specifically, Purnaveja provides synchronization scripts and associated annotated multimedia

streams (see, for example, col. 2, lines 36-39 of Purnaveja). The synchronization scripts include annotation streams, while the annotated multimedia streams include a compressed video stream for display in a video window, an accompanying compressed audio stream, and annotations (see, for example, col. 2, lines 41-45 of Purnaveja). The annotation streams are used to synchronize the display of video streams with the annotations (which includes HTML pages with Java applets) (see, for example, col. 2, lines 42-46 of Purnaveja).

In other words, Purnaveja uses annotation streams of the synchronization scripts to display the video streams synchronously with the annotation (which includes HTML pages with Java applets). That is, the HTML pages with the Java applets are synchronized with the video streams, rather than having the HTML pages synchronized with the Java applets. Thus, as Purnaveja fails to disclose or suggest synchronizing a markup document and an applet, Purnaveja is further deficient.

Second, Sani fails to overcome even the acknowledged deficiency of Purnaveja because Sani fails to disclose or suggest delaying display of image output information for the markup document, as defined in claims 1 or 15, or delay of display of the markup document, as defined in claim 9. Instead, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Sani discloses delaying applet data. Specifically, Sani discloses sleep() and suspend() applicable to the applet, for example (see, pages 2 and 3 of Sani).

Accordingly, based on the above, Purnaveja is further deficient, in addition to the acknowledged deficiency, and Sani fails to overcome Purnaveja's deficiencies. Thus, claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend from claim 9, claims 16-18, which depend from claim 15, and claims 20 and 21, which depend from claim 19, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 4/30/2008

By: Seth S. Kim

Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510